



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,977	11/20/2003	Jee-Soo Mok	LEPA122042	8002
26389	7590	03/17/2006	EXAMINER	
CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC 1420 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 2800 SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347			TRINH, MICHAEL MANH	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2822	

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/717,977	MOK ET AL. <i>(initials)</i>
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael Trinh	2822

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 07 March 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

(a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

(c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
**Michael Trinh**  
**Primary Examiner**

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of rejections and clear reasons as of record.

\*\*\* Applicant remarked that "...Claim 1 means that circuit pattern are formed, such as by etchings on the outermost layers after the board is pressed...".

In response, again, this is noted and found unconvincing. Limitations in the specification cannot be read into the claim. Nowhere in claim 1 recites "...by etching...after the board is pressed...". Claim 1 just called for "forming circuit pattern on the outermost layers of the board...". Claimed subject matter, not the specification, is the measure of invention. Limitations in the specification cannot be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding the prior art. In Re Self, 213 USPQ 1,5 (CCPA 1982); In Re Priest, 199 USPQ 11,15 (CCPA 1978).

In this case, as clearly shown in Figure 4 of admitted prior art, circuit patterns are formed on the outermost layers of a pressed board. By pressing the circuit layers having the circuit patterns and the insulating layers to form a board, the circuit patterns are formed on the board.

\*\*\* Applicant alleged that "...If the circuit patterns are formed on layers 106a and 106c before pressing, circuit layers cannot be formed again after pressing..."

In response, first, substep (c) of step (A) of independent claims 1,14, and 15 recites "forming CIRCUIT PATTERNS...", and then step (E) also recites "forming CIRCUIT PATTERNS...". Then, according to applicant's above remarks, if the circuit patterns are already formed on the layers, before pressing, the circuit patterns cannot be formed again after pressing as claimed by Applicant's claimed invention.

Second, etching a conductive circuit layer would form circuit patterns on an outermost layers of the circuit layers. However, there is no etching step in these independent claims. In admitted prior art, pressing would thus form the circuit patterns on an outermost layer of the pressed board. Accordingly, rejections are still outstanding since these claims do not require "...by etching...after the board is pressed..." as remarked by Applicant. Limitations in the specification cannot read into the claims.

\*\*\* Applicant remarked that in Kim, the via holes 304 are plugged by copper.

In response, this is noted and found unconvincing. Plugging copper in the via holes in the circuit layer before pressing to the insulating layer is taught by Kim in one embodiment (e.g. Figures 7,8). However, omitting the plugging process of the via holes is taught by Kim in another embodiment (e.g. paragraph 0060-0063; Figs 2C,2D-2E). Thus, pressing the circuit layer having unplugged via holes (by omitting the plugging process) to the insulating layer 506a (Fig 7) having conductive paste, the unplugged via hole is now filled with the conductive paste from the insulating layer. Claimed subject matter, not the specification, is the measure of invention. Limitations in the specification cannot be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding the prior art. In Re Self, 213 USPQ 1,5 (CCPA 1982); In Re Priest, 199 USPQ 11,15 (CCPA 1978).

The rejections are outstanding and maintained.



Michael Trinh  
Primary Examiner